MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, February 26, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 10, 1952, were approved.

2. EXHIBITION ON THE PLAN OF WASHINGTON AT THE LINCOLN MUSEUM: The Secretary reported that, while Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Administration had promised at the January meeting to hold secure the Gallery adjacent to the Commission Room for an Exhibition on the Plan of Washington, he felt certain this would not be made available, as subsequent events have proved (Exhibit A), and that therefore he arranged with Mr. Frank T. Gartside, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, to have such an Exhibition at the Lincoln Museum near 10th and F Streets, Northwest; that Chairman Finley approved of the suggestion (Exhibit B) and that since then the model of the Plan of 1901 in the Commission Room has been relocated there, along with somewhat more than 150 framed pictures, maps, and the like, most of which were shown at the Corcoran Gallery of Art during the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950. Similarly, the model of the Plan of 1901, showing Washington as it existed prior to 1900 will

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

The sixth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Tuesday, February 26, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Reild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Bellusechi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,

also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on January 10, 1952, were approved.

2. EXHIBITION ON THE PLAN OF WASHINGTON AT THE ILLOQUIN MUSEUM: The Secretary reported that, while Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Administration had promised at the January meeting to hold secure the Gallery adjacent to the Commission Room for an exhibition on the Plan of Washington, he felt certain this would not be made available, as subsequent events have proved (Exhibit A), and that therefore he arranged with Mr. Frank T. Gartside, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, to have such an Exhibition at the Lincoln Museum near 10th and F Streets, Northwest; that Chairman Finley approved of the suggestion (Exhibit B) and that since then the model of the Plan of 1901 in the Commission Room has been relocated there, along with somewhat more than 150 framed pictures, maps, and the like, most of which were shown at the Corcoran Gallery of Art during the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1950. Similarly, the model of the Plan of 1901, showing Washington as it existed prior to 1900 will

also be placed on exhibition there. Thousands of visitors who come to the Lincoln Museum each year will see the Exhibition.

The Commission were much pleased with the arrangement made and thanked the Secretary for having accomplished this.

3. CHESAPEAKE & OHIO CANAL; and THE WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT NEAR THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: The Secretary reported that, following the statement of Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Administration that the Heurich Brewery is believed to be in part on Government owned land, since the C & O Canal was formerly on this site, he had made careful inquiry and presented a print of a map of the District of Columbia, dated 1867, showing the above location of the canal on the site above mentioned, as also a picture of the incomplete Washington Monument, showing the C & O Canal in that locality; as well as a picture of the Washington Aqueduct, dated 1864, showing the C & O Canal. The information was conveyed to Mr. Reynolds, who expressed his appreciation of it (Exhibit C).

4. COPPER AND BRASS INDUSTRY SESQUICENTENNIAL: Mr. Finley reported that recently Mr. Waldo Fawcett, Assistant Editor of the Washington Evening Star, had informed him that the Copper and Brass Industry proposed to observe its Sesquicentennial Celebration this year, and requested advice as to a suitable memorial; that they are interested in a Commemorative Stamp, but that Mr. Fawcett suggested something more important, such as a replica of the Statue of Liberty in stainless brass, to be erected on public grounds in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Finley said he objected to having a memorial in brass erected on public grounds, and in this the Commission concurred. Mr. deWeldon said that brass is an alloy consisting of 60% copper and 40% zinc, while bronze contains 90% copper and 10% tin. The Commission suggested a copper fountain, and Mr. Fawcett was informed accordingly (Exhibit D).

5. YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS: Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Chief of the Heraldic Branch, Research and Development Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department

also be placed on exhibition there. Thousands of visitors who come to the Lincoln Museum each year will see the exhibition.

The Commission were much pleased with the arrangement made and thanked the Secretary for having accomplished this.

3. ORGANIZERS & OHIO CANAL: and THE WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT NEAR THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL: The Secretary reported that, following the abatement of Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings administration that the Lincoln Brewery is believed to be in part on Government owned land, since the C & O Canal was formerly on this site, he had made careful inquiry and presented a print of a map of the District of Columbia, dated 1857, showing the above location of the canal on the site above mentioned, as also a picture of the incomplete Washington Monument, showing the C & O Canal in that locality; as well as a picture of the Washington Aqueduct, dated 1859, showing the C & O Canal. The information was conveyed to Mr. Reynolds, who expressed his appreciation of it (Exhibit C).

4. COPPER AND BRASS INDUSTRY SPECIFICATIONS: Mr. Finley reported that recently Mr. Waldo Fawcett, Assistant Editor of the Washington Evening Star, had informed him that the Copper and Brass Industry proposed to observe its sesquicentennial celebration this year, and requested advice as to a suitable memorial; that they are interested in a Commemorative Stamp, but that Mr. Fawcett suggested something more important, such as a replica of the Statue of Liberty in stainless brass, to be erected on public ground in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Finley said he objected to having a memorial in brass erected on public ground, and in this the Commission concurred. Mr. deWeldon said that brass is an alloy consisting of 90% copper and 10% zinc, while bronze contains 90% copper and 10% tin. The Commission suggested a copper fountain, and Mr. Fawcett was instructed accordingly (Exhibit D).

5. YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS: Mr. Arthur T. DuBois, Chief of the Numismatic Section and Development Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department

of the Army, accompanied by the sculptor Thomas Hudson Jones, submitted a Memorandum, as follows:

February 26, 1952

(a) Young American Medal for Service (Obverse)

(b) Young American Medal for Bravery (Obverse)

Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor. Executed in accordance with authorized legislation, Public Law 638, 81st Congress,

The medals to be of gold approximately the size of the U. S. Half Dollar. The reverse of the medals is to consist of engraving only.

On the obverse of the Medal for Service is an eagle rising, wings displayed and inverted, grasping an open scroll of honor in his talons and encircled by the inscription Young American Medal For Service.

On the obverse of the Medal for Bravery is a laurel wreath surmounted by a bow with drawn arrow (signifying speed in action).

The ribbons for the medals have not been approved (a different ribbon for each medal).

The Commission inspected the models and were well satisfied with them. The models were approved, and Mr. DuBois was informed accordingly (Exhibit E)

6. LEIF EIRICSSON STATUE: The Commission considered the following letter received by Chairman Finley from Senator Warren G. Magnuson:

January 26, 1952

Dear Mr. Finley:

For several years I have been interested in having placed in Washington D. C., a bronze statue of Leif Eiricsson which currently is at the Newport News maritime museum.

I have recently received a cost estimate from Mr. Harry T. Thompson of the National Capital Parks, which indicates that the cost of landscaping the grounds, driving the necessary piling and erecting a suitable pedestal for the statue would be in excess of $52,000. It would appear that such a cost would make it impossible to erect the statue at this time. Therefore I am writing to inquire as to the attitude of the Commission concerning a much less ornate pedestal on which the statue could be placed. I would appreciate your views on the matter.

Very truly yours,
Warren G. Magnuson, U.S.S.

The Commission discussed the subject with Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson said that the location which is being considered is one along the Potomac River, near the Inlet Bridge, in Potomac Park, about 400 feet north of the Highway Bridge, which site was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts a number of years ago, and where the statue is to have a pedestal similar to the one at Reykjavik, Iceland.

The Secretary reported that the project has been pending since the close of the World's Fair in New York in 1939, where this statue was exhibited (being a

of the Army, accompanied by the sculptor Thomas Hudson Jones, submitted a Memorandum, as follows:

February 2[illegible], 1932

(a) Young American Medal for Service (Obverse)

(b) Young American Medal for Bravery (Obverse)

Thomas Hudson Jones, sculptor. Executed in accordance with authorized legislation, Public Law 253, 81st Congress.

The medals vo be of gold approximately the size of the U. S. Half Dollar. The reverse of the medals is to consist of engraving only.

On the obverse of the Medal for Service is an eagle rising, wings displayed and inverted, grasping an open scroll of honor in his talons and encircled by the inscription Young American Medal For Service.

On the obverse of the Medal for Bravery is a laurel wreath surmounted by a bow with drawn arrow (signifying speed in action).

The ribbons for the medals have not been approved (a different ribbon for each medal).

The Commission inspected the models and were well satisfied with them.

The models were approved, and Mr. Dejoia was informed accordingly (Exhibit E)

6. LEIF ERICSSON STATUE: The Commission considered the following letter received by Chairman Finley from Senator Warren C. Magnuson:

January 26, 1932

Dear Mr. Finley:

For several years I have been interested in having placed in Washington D. C., a bronze statue of Leif Ericsson which currently is at the Newport News maritime museum.

I have recently received a cost estimate from Mr. Harry T. Thompson of the National Capital Parks, which indicates that the cost of landscaping the grounds, driving the necessary piling and erecting a suitable pedestal for the statue would be in excess of $52,000. It would appear that such a cost would make it impossible to erect the statue at this time. Therefore I am writing to inquire as to the attitude of the Commission concerning a much less costly pedestal on which the statue could be placed. I would appreciate your views on the matter.

Very truly yours,

Warren G. Magnuson, U.S.S.

The Commission discussed the subject with Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson said that the location which is being considered is one along the Potomac River, near the Inlet Bridge, in Potomac Park, about 400 feet north of the Highway Bridge, where the statue is to have a general similar to the one at Reykjavik, Iceland, which site was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts a number of years ago, and the Secretary reported that the project has been pending since the close of the World's Fair in New York in 1939, where this statue was exhibited (being a

duplicate of the one presented to Iceland by the United States Government in 1930. The statue is now on a temporary pedestal in front of the Marine Museum at Newport News, Virginia. Photographs of the statue and of its present location were shown.

Mr. Thompson stated that the estimate of $52,000 for the pedestal and grounds is reasonable, since Potomac Park consists of reclaimed land, and at that location the pedestal would have to be underpinned.

Later in the day the Commission visited the site and agreed with the statements by Mr. Thompson regarding the pedestal and estimate.

The Secretary reported that there are Icelandic residents of North Dakota who are much interested in the proposed location along the Potomac and believe they can raise the $52,000 needed for the project.

Before taking further action in the matter, the Commission decided to report to Senator Magnuson, and await further advice from him (Exhibit F), see also F-1.

7. LEGISLATIVE BILLS: The Commission considered the following Bills:

H. R. 6166, "To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the General Services Administration." Introduced by Congressman Kearns. A National War Memorial is proposed for the City of Washington, to be a suitable theater and opera house.

H. R. 6158, "To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts." Introduced by Congressman Celler. A National War Memorial is proposed; theater and Opera House.

H. R. 6141,"To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts," for expenditure by a National War Memorial Arts Commission. Introduced by Congressman Wier.

Chairman Finley stated that he wrote to Congressman Wier that he would bring the above-mentioned bill to the attention of the Commission.

The Commission concurred in the suggestion that a National Opera House be built in Washington, and that fully $1,000,000 which is available from Sesquicentennial Funds be made available to General Services for it. (Exhibit G)

8. APPLICATION NO. 295, OLD GEORGETOWN: The Secretary presented this application received from the Building Inspector for a roof sign at 1014 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W., proposed by the Rosslyn Steel Company. The sign is to measure

implicate of the one presented to Iceland by the United States Government in 1930. The statue is now on a temporary pedestal in front of the Marine Museum at Newport News, Virginia. Photographs of the statue and of its present location were shown.

Mr. Thompson stated that the estimate of $52,000 for the pedestal and grounds is reasonable, since Potomac Park consists of reclaimed land, and at that location the pedestal would have to be underpinned.

Later in the day the Commission visited the site and agreed with the statements by Mr. Thompson regarding the pedestal and estimate.

The Secretary reported that there are Icelandic residents of North Dakota who are much interested in the proposed location along the Potomac and believe they can raise the $52,000 needed for the project.

Before taking further action in the matter, the Commission decided to report to Senator Magnuson, and await further advice from him (Exhibit F), see also C-1.

7. LEGISLATIVE BILLS: The Commission considered the following Bills:

H. R. 6166, "To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the General Services Administration." Introduced by Congressman Keams. A National War Memorial is proposed for the City of Washington, to be a suitable theater and opera house.

H. R. 6192, "To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts." Introduced by Congressman Geller. A National War Memorial is proposed; theater and Opera House.

H. R. 6111,"To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts," for expenditure by a National War Memorial Arts Commission. Introduced by Congressman Wier.

Chairman Finley stated that he wrote to Congressman Wier that he would bring the above-mentioned bill to the attention of the Commission.

The Commission concurred in the suggestion that a National Opera House be built in Washington, and that fully $1,000,000 which is available from Sesquicentennial funds be made available to General Services for it. (Exhibit G)

8. APPLICATION NO. 295, OLD GEORGETOWN: The Secretary presented this application received from the Building Inspector for a roof sign at 1014 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W., proposed by the Roselyn Steel Company. The sign is to measure

2' x 25'. The Secretary stated that under the Regulations no roof signs are permitted, and that this sign is twice as large as the 25 square feet area allowed by the Regulations of the Commission.

The Commission considered the application, and on motion properly moved and seconded, the application was disapproved. The Building Inspector was notified accordingly.

9. S. 1712, CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS MEMORIAL GROVE: Chairman Finley brought to the attention of the Commission a copy of a letter referred by the Director of the Budget, addressed to Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, concerning this project, and suggesting that the matter of naming the trees adjacent to Memorial Avenue extending to Arlington National Cemetery the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove be left for decision by Congress.

The Commission reaffirmed the opinion expressed in a letter addressed to the Bureau of the Budget on July 30, 1951, that the establishment of such a memorial grove at that location is not deemed appropriate. A letter was therefore sent to Senator O'Mahoney accordingly (EXHIBIT H). See also H-1.

10. PEDESTAL FOR STATUE, LAST FAREWELL: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, presented a photograph of a design by McKim, Mead and White, architects, and Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, together with a letter from him, which was read, as follows:

Dear Mr. Thompson: February 18, 1952

I have today finished and colored the new pedestal for "The Last Farewell" statue and am pleased to say that the new arrangement of pedestal and statue is a decided improvement over the former pedestal. It is in the "Drum" design suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, and I have colored it a verigated black granite, which harmonizes very well with the green patina over gold leaf suggested by the Commission.

In addition to this, I have restudied and enlarged the cloud motif between statue and pedestal, which adds greatly to the general composition. I had hoped to send you a kodachrome showing color arrangement and its general effect in the niche, but find that I cannot get this to you in time for the meeting on the 26th, so I am sending you a black and white photograph instead for presentation to the Commission.

I will send you tomorrow two black granite samples requested by the Commission. The small sample "Black Pearl" I have used on a memorial

21' x 25'. The Secretary stated that under the regulations no roof signs are permitted, and that this sign is twice as large as the 25 square feet area allowed by the Regulations of the Commission.

The Commission considered the application, and on motion properly moved and seconded, the application was disapproved. The Building Inspector was notified accordingly.

9. S. 1712, CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS MEMORIAL GROVE: Chairman Tinlay brought to the attention of the Commission a copy of a letter referred by the Director of the Budget, addressed to Senator Joseph O. O'Mahoney, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, concerning this project, and suggesting that the matter of naming the trees adjacent to Memorial Avenue extending to Arlington National Cemetery the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove be left for decision by Congress.

The Commission reaffirmed the opinion expressed in a letter addressed to the Bureau of the Budget on July 30, 1952, that the establishment of such a memorial grove at that location is not deemed appropriate. A letter was therefore sent to Senator O'Mahoney accordingly (EXHIBIT H). See also H-1.

10. PENNSYLVANIA STATION, EAST PLATFORM: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent of National Capital Parks, Historic Park Service, presented a photograph of a design by McKim, Mead and White, architects, and Mr. A. Wadsworth, sculptor, together with a letter from him, which was read, as follows:

February 18, 1952

Dear Mr. Thompson:

I have today finished and colored the new pedestal for "The Last Farewell" statue and am pleased to say that the new arrangement of the pedestal and statue is a decided improvement over the former pedestal. It is in the "Drum" design suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, and I have colored it a variated black granite, which harmonizes very well with the green patina over gold leaf suggested by the Commission.

In addition to this, I have restudied and enlarged the cloud motif between plinths and pedestal, which adds greatly to the general composition. I had hoped to send you a lantern chowing color arrangement and its general effect in the niche, but find that I cannot get this to you in time for the meeting on the 20th, so I am sending you a black and white photograph instead for presentation to the Commission.

I will send you tomorrow two black prints showing the proposed by the [illegible]. The small sample "Black Pearl" I have used on a material

and found it an excellent granite. The larger sample "Cordova Black" seems too fine grained and monotonous in color.

Recalling the fact that there has been a question about the symbolism embodied in the "Last Farewell" statue, I would briefly state the following:

In my sketch model, as well as in the larger working model for the statue, "The Last Farewell," I have endeavored to create a spirit of solemnity befitting the occasion of the burial of one of the Nation's members of the Armed Forces. The figure of the departed soldier, having made the supreme sacrifice in the fullness of his powers, stands partly enveloped in his shroud, his shield over his back, his sheathed sword pressed to his side and his right hand raised in silent salute to his departing comrade in arms.

Trusting the Commission will find it possible to take definite action in the related matters of statue and pedestal and with due appreciation of your untiring efforts to reach a final solution of this long delayed project, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. A. Weinman

The Commission inspected the photograph and discussed the subject. The Commission were not at all satisfied with the design and disapproved it. The Commission recommended that a simple rectangular pedestal be designed, and also suggested that the fountain basin be omitted and that there be less extension of the representation of a cloud at the base of the figure.

Mr. Thompson presented the two samples of granite—a large piece of "Cordova Black" and a smaller sample of "Black Pearl" granite. During the inspection of them it was suggested that also Mount Airy Granite, which was used for the Memorial Bridge and the niche, also be considered for the pedestal.

A report was sent to Mr. Thompson accordingly (Exhibit I). A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit I-1).

11. GOVERNMENT AND ART: In accordance with arrangements made, Mr. Earl Minderman, Assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, met with the Commission to discuss the subject of Broadcasting. Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, had sent a preliminary report, a copy of which had been sent by the Secretary to each of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts for consideration prior to the meeting.

Mr. Minderman gave enlightening information concerning the problems of the Federal Communications Commission as to broadcasting by Radio and also by Television. A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these

and found it an excellent granite. The larger sample "Cordova Black" seems too fine grained and monotonous in color.

Recalling the fact that there has been a question about the symbolism embodied in the "Last Farewell" statue, I would briefly state the following:

In my sketch model, as well as in the larger working model for the statue, "The Last Farewell," I have endeavored to create a spirit of solemnity befitting the occasion of the burial of one of the Nation's members of the Armed Forces. The figure of the departed soldier, having made the supreme sacrifice in the fulfillment of his powers, stands partly enveloped in his shroud, his shield over his back, his sheathed sword pressed to his side and his right hand raised in silent salute to his departing comrade in arms.

Trusting the Commission will find it possible to take favorable action in the related matters of statue and pedestal and with due appreciation of your unstinting efforts to reach a final solution of this long delayed project, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. J. Weinman

The Commission inspected the photograph and discussed the subject. The Commission were not at all satisfied with the design and disapproved it. The Commission recommended that a simple rectangular pedestal be designed, and also suggested that the fountain basin be omitted and that there be less extension of the representation of a cloud at the base of the figure.

Mr. Thompson presented the two samples of granite--a large piece of "Cordova Black" and a smaller sample of "Black Pearl" granite. During the inspection of them it was suggested that also Mount Airy Granite, which was used for the Memorial Bridge and the niche, also be considered for the pedestal.

A report was sent to Mr. Thompson accordingly (Exhibit I). A copy of the discussion is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit I-1).

II. GOVERNMENT AND ART: In accordance with arrangements made, Mr. Carl Lindeman, Assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, met with the Commission to discuss the subject of Broadcasting. Mr. Ayre Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, had sent a preliminary report, a copy of which had been sent by the Secretary to each of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts for consideration prior to the meeting.

Mr. Lindeman gave enlightening information concerning the problems of the Federal Communications Commission as to broadcasting by Radio and also by Tele-

Minutes (Exhibit J).

On request of Chairman Finley, Colonel Bonner, who was present, agreed to prepare a summary of the discussion so as to become a part of the Final Report on Government and Art to the President.

12. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY ON GOVERNMENT AND ART: Colonel Bonner presented to the Commission of Fine Arts a 65-page Summary of the testimony contained in the four Volumes of Testimony on the subject of Government and Art from about fifty witnesses that appeared before the Commission of Fine Arts during the past year. The Secretary had this Summary mimeographed and furnished each member a copy for consideration at this meeting of the Commission.

Colonel Bonner also presented an Outline (Exhibit K) as a guide for the Report on Government and Art to be sent to the President. The Commission considered this briefly.

A discussion followed, during which it was decided that some time might be required before the report can be made ready for submission to the President. Attention was called to the splendid Report made by the Canadian Government on "Arts, Letters and Sciences of Canada" on which a Royal Commission spent two years.

Professor Hudnut, who had been asked by the Commission to draft the report for the Commission of Fine Arts, said he is very much crowded for time at present but would be able to write the report during the coming summer, and thus welcomed the additional time allowed.

13. TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: Under date of February 1, 1952, the following letter was received from Colonel James B. Clearwater, Chief of the Memorial Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army:

> Reference is made to telephonic conversation of 15 January, 1952, between Mr. Troeger, of this Office, and Mr. Caemmerer, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts.
>
> In accordance with the suggestion made by Mr. Caemmerer, during the conversation, the Commission is requested to consider at its meeting on 26 February, 1952, the proposed relocation of the boxwood hedge, now

Ukuuba (Exhibit 4).

On request of Chairman Finley, Colonel Bonner, who was present, agreed to prepare a summary of the discussion so as to become a part of the Final Report on Government and Art to the President.

12. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY ON GOVERNMENT AND ART: Colonel Bonner presented to the Commission of Fine Arts a 57-page Summary of the testimony contained in the four Volumes of Testimony on the subject of Government and Art from about fifty witnesses that appeared before the Commission of Fine Arts during the past year. The Secretary had this Summary mimeographed and furnished each member a copy for consideration at this meeting of the Commission.

Colonel Bonner also presented an Outline (Exhibit 5) as a Guide for the Report on Government and Art to be sent to the President. The Commission considered this briefly.

A discussion followed, during which it was decided that some time might be required before the report can be made ready for submission to the President. Attention was called to the splendid Report made by the Canadian Government on "Arts, Letters and Sciences of Canada" on which a Royal Commission spent two years.

Professor Hamlin, who had been asked by the Commission to draft the report for the Commission of Fine Arts, said he is very much crowded for time at present but would be able to write the report during the coming summer, and that he agreed the additions that were offered.

13. TOWN OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: Under date of February 1, 1926, the following letter was received from Colonel James E. Chesney, Chief of the Memorial Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, regarding the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier:

[illegible] is made to telephonic conversation of 19 January, 1926, between Mr. Treager, of this Office, and Mr. Demarest, Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts.

In accordance with the suggestion made by Mr. Demarest, during the conversation, the Commission is requested to consider the [illegible] on 26 February, 1926, the proposed relocation of the memorial marker, now

situated adjacent to the northerly and southerly sides of the plaza between the reception building of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, to the location indicated in red on the inclosed print (Incl.1).

The relocation of the hedge has been requested by The Commanding General of the Military District of Washington, for the purpose of providing adequate unimpeded assembly space for the various service groups and the 85-piece band, which usually attend the many wreath-laying ceremonies at the "Tomb."

Inasmuch as the ultimate plan for the reconstruction of the Plaza and Tomb, to accommodate the remains of the World War II Unknown, provides for the removal of the boxwood hedge to the approximate position indicated, favorable action by the Commission is recommended. It is requested that a representative of this Office be permitted to appear before the Commission in connection with its consideration of this matter.

The Commission visited the site at the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater during the noon hour. Mr. Peets gave the design particular attention, in view of landscape features involved. After discussion, the Commission decided that the hedge in question should be planted slightly to the west of the location proposed in the design. A report was sent to Colonel Clearwater accordingly (Exhibit L).

14. FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY: Under date of February 13th, the following letter was received from Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library:

"The Folger Library, a privately endowed institution at 201 East Capitol Street, administered by the Trustees of Amherst College, wishes to fill in with masonry windows on the inner court of the Library opening out on the parking lot, in order to protect our books from natural light and to give additional protection to the interior of the building in case of bombing. We plan to use the same type of brick as in the present wall, and we expect to leave the present steel grilled bars over the window spaces for added protection. All of this construction is in the rear of the building facing on an inner court and it will not affect the appearnace of the building.

We also wish to build two masonry walls in the sub-basement to provide additional vault space.

Our contractor, the William P. Lipscomb Company, Inc., informs us that it is necessary for us to get approval from the Fine Arts Commission for an exterior alteration.

We are anxious to have this work between late in March so that it can be completed before our rush period in the late spring, and I shall appreciate it if you will let me know what further steps, if any, are needed so as to expedite action by the Fine Arts Commission.

The Secretary stated that he telephoned to Dr. Wright, informing him that the Folger Shakespeare Library comes within the area prescribed in what is known as

the Shipstead-Luce Act, and that the Commission could arrange to make the desired inspection during the afternoon meeting, on February 26th.

Accordingly, the Commission met with Dr. Wright about 3:00 p.m. Dr. Wright explained the problem in hand. Regarding the suggestion made by him that the steel grilled bars over the window spaces be retained, the Commission felt that they would not provide added protection, and recommended that they be omitted. Prof. Belluschi suggested to Dr. Wright that the contractor be instructed to allow air space between the brick masonry, in order to prevent moisture on the interior wall and thus give added protection to the books.

A report was sent to Dr. Wright (Exhibit M).

15. UNITED STATES CAPITOL: FRIEZE IN THE ROTUNDA: In accordance with a request received from Honorable David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, the Commission visited the Rotunda of the Capitol to inspect the Frieze which was left in an incomplete state since the death of the Sculptor, Constantino Brumidi, in 1880. Mr. Lynn stated that Congress has appropriated $20,000 to complete the Frieze, in accordance with Public Law 703, 81st Congress, approved August 17, 1950 (Exhibit N).

Chairman Finley stated that some months ago Mr. John Walker, Chief Curator of the National Gallery of Art, was requested by Senator Green for advice as to a competent fresco painter to complete this work, and that Mr. Walker recommended Mr. Allyn Cox, 135 East 40th Street, New York City. Mr. Finley presented a Memorandum to the Commission, setting forth the qualifications of Allyn Cox, and the Commission concurred in his selection for this project. A copy of the Memorandum (Exhibit N-1) was handed to Mr. Lynn.

16. THE WHITE HOUSE: Chairman Finley reported the receipt of a letter from Mrs. J. M. Helm, Secretary to Mrs. Truman, requesting a list of the home addresses of the members of the Commission, together with the names of the adult members of their immediate families actually residing with them, "for use in

members of their immediate families actually residing with them, "for use in addressee of the members of the Commission, together with the names of one adult from Mrs. d. M. Hein, Secretary to Mrs. Truman, requesting a list of the home

16. THE WHITE HOUSE: Chairman Finley reported the receipt of a letter remarks (Exhibit H-1) was issued to Mr. Lynn.

the Commission concurred in his selection for this project. A copy of the Memorandum to the Commission, setting forth the qualifications of Allyn Cox, and Mr. Allyn Cox, 139 East 40th Street, New York City. Mr. Finley presented a a competent Fresco painter to complete this work, and that Mr. Heiser recommended of the National Gallery of Art, was requested by Director Green for advice as to

1950 (Exhibit M).

Chairman Finley stated that some months ago Mr. John Walker, Chief Curator Frieze, in accordance with Public Law 703, 81st Congress, approved August 17, 1850. Mr. Lynn stated that Congress has appropriated $20,000 to complete the in an incomplete state since the death of the Sculptor, Constantino Brumidi, in mission visited the Rotunda of the Capitol to inspect the Frieze which was left request received from Honorable David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, the Com-

15. UNITED STATES CAPITOL: PAINTING IN THE ROTUNDA: In accordance with a

A report was sent to Dr. Wright (Exhibit L).

insertion well and thus give added protection to the books.

allow air space between the brick masonry, in order to prevent moisture on the Prof. Bellinsoni suggested to Dr. Wright that the contractor be instructed to they would not provide added protection, and recommended that they be omitted. steel grilled bars over the window spaces be retained. The Commission felt that explained the problem in hand. Regarding the suggestion made by him that the

Accordingly, the Commission met with Dr. Wright about 3:00 p.m. Dr. Wright

inspection during the afternoon meeting, on February 20th.

the Shipstead-Luce Act, and that the Commission could arrange to have the desired

connection with some informal receptions which the President and Mrs. Truman may hold this spring. . . ." The list is being sent to Mrs. Helm accordingly.

17. BARRACKS, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT: The Commission inspected a perspective and a set of working drawings, submitted by Arthur L. Anderson, Architect, 1726 M Street, N. W. for a barracks building for 500 Airmen, proposed for erection on grounds west of the Washington National Airport. It is to replace old temporary buildings which are there now.

The Architect Members of the Commission gave the design particular attention. They expressed keen regret and disappointment that plans for such a project should be brought to the Commission at this stage. They were not at all satisfied with the plans for future buildings in that area, and felt that a new study should be made.

Mr. William Fahey, who presented the drawings on behalf of the Architect, stated that he had been informed that the Department of the Army may require a restudy to meet estimates of cost. Thereupon, the Commission unanimously recommended that a restudy of the design be made.

The Commission also expressed preference for a facade of concrete rather than one of cinder blocks and brick panels as proposed. A report was sent to Mr. Anderson accordingly. (Exhibit O).

18. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Friday, March 28, 1952.

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The Commission had luncheon at the National Gallery of Art with Colonel Bonner as guest.

connection with some informal receptions which the President and Mrs. Truman may hold this spring. . . ." The list is being sent to Mrs. Helm accordingly.

17. BARRACKS, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT: The Commission inspected a perspective and a set of working drawings, submitted by Arthur I. Anderson, Architect, 1726 M Street, N. W. for a barracks building for FCC Airmen, proposed for erection on grounds west of the Washington National Airport. It is to replace old temporary buildings which are there now.

The Architect Members of the Commission gave the design particular attention. They expressed keen regret and disappointment that plans for such a project should be brought to the Commission at this stage. They were not at all satisfied with the plans for future buildings in that area, and felt that a new study should be made.

Mr. William Farby, who presented the drawings on behalf of the Architect, stated that he had been informed that the Department of the Army may require a restudy to meet estimates of cost. Thereupon, the Commission unanimously recommended that a restudy of the design be made.

The Commission also expressed preference for a facade of concrete rather than one of cinder blocks and brick panels as proposed. A report was sent to Mr. Anderson accordingly. (Exhibit O).

18. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Friday, March 28, 1952.

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m. The Commission had luncheon at the National Gallery of Art with Colonel Bonner as guest.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE
Washington D. C.

February 21, 1952

In Reply Refer To: 3PBS

Honorable David E. Finley
Director, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

We have made a survey of the possibility of using the Gallery adjacent to the space assigned to your Commission for exhibiting the plans and models of your Commission.

This space is now being used by the Department of Interior for emergency activities. That Department has been pressing for additional space for some time but because of the critical space situation in Washington we have not been able to meet their full demands. While we can appreciate your problem, I regret that there is little possibility that this space can be made available in the near future.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) L. A. Ziernicki
L. A. Ziernicki
Acting Deputy Regional Director
Public Buildings Service

EXHIBIT A

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE
Washington D. C.

February 21, 1952

In Reply Refer To: 3PBS

Honorable David E. Finley
Director, Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

We have made a survey of the possibility of using the Gallery adjacent to the space assigned to your Commission for exhibiting the plans and models of your Commission.

This space is now being used by the Department of Interior for emergency activities. That Department has been pressing for additional space for some time but because of the critical space situation in Washington we have not been able to meet their full demands. While we can appreciate your problem, I regret that there is little possibility that this space can be made available in the near future.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) I. A. Zierfield
I. A. Zierfield
Acting Deputy Regional Director
Public Buildings Service

EXHIBIT A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 21, 1952.

Dear Mr. Gartside:

For a period of many years the Commission of Fine Arts has had in its custody a series of designs, pictures and models on the Plan of Washington. They tell the story of the origin and development of our National Capital from the time of the adoption of the L'Enfant Plan of 1791. The group comprises somewhat more than fifty items, including two large models (17' x 9' each), which the McMillan Park Commission had made in 1902, when the Plan of Washington was revived and enlarged and the L'Enfant Plan restored. They have been exhibited on many occasions and have been found to be of great interest.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, the Secretary of this Commission, has informed me that you are willing to provide space for this Exhibition on the Plan of Washington, so that in due time it may be seen by the many visitors who come to Washington. Since I have been authorized by the Commission of Fine Arts to find another location for it, I hereby place the Exhibition into the custody of your Office, of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

The Exhibition is of great historical value and interest and we believe the many visitors to Washington will be delighted to see it in your care. A list of the items will be sent to you.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Frank T. Gartside,
Assistant Superintendent,
National Capital Parks,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Public Buildings Service

Washington 25, D. C.

February 13, 1952

In Reply Refer To: P

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I am particularly pleased to have a print of the map of the District of Columbia dated 1862, and also the photograph of the incomplete Washington Monument, taken in 1867.

There has certainly been great controversy about the old Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The owners of some of this property believe they have a clear title, although in no sense have we agreed with them. The map that you sent is certainly strong supporting data for the position we have taken.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings

EXHIBIT C

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Public Buildings Service

Washington 25, D. C.

February 13, 1952

In Reply Refer To: P

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I am particularly pleased to have a print of the map of the District of Columbia dated 1852, and also the photograph of the incomplete Washington Monument, taken in 1857.

There has certainly been great controversy about the old Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The owners of some of this property believe they have a clear title, although in no sense have we agreed with them. The map that you sent is certainly strong supporting data for the position we have taken.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
H. L. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 28, 1952

Dear Mr. Fawcett:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on February 26, 1952, I informed the Commission of the proposed Copper and Brass Industry Memorial, which is to mark their Sesquicentennial Anniversary. The Commission did not favor the erection of a memorial in brass, but suggested that a copper fountain might be suitable.

Of course, as you know, if such a memorial is to be erected on public grounds in the District of Columbia, it will be necessary to secure an authorization from Congress to that effect.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Mr. Waldo Fawcett,
The Evening Star,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 29, 1952

Dear Mr. DuBois:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting of February 26, 1952, considered the models which you submitted:

a. Young American Medal for Service (Obverse)

b. Young American Medal for Bravery (Obverse)

It was noted that these models were made by Thomas Hudson Jones, Sculptor of your Office. The Commission of Fine Arts unanimously approved the models.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Mr. Arthur E. DuBois,
Chief, Heraldic Branch,
Research & Development Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Department of the Army,
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 29, 1952

Dear Mr. DuBois:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting of February 26, 1952, considered the models which you submitted:

a. Young American Medal for Service (Obverse)

b. Young American Medal for Bravery (Obverse)

It was noted that these models were made by Thomas Hudson Jones, Sculptor of Your Office. The Commission of Fine Arts unanimously approved the models.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Mr. Arthur R. DuBois,
Chief, Heraldic Branch,
Research & Development Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Department of the Army,
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

February 28, 1952

Dear Senator Magnuson:

In further reference to my letter of February 1st, I am pleased to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held on February 26, 1952, gave careful consideration to the question of erecting a bronze statue of Leif Eiricsson in the City of Washington. The Commission also visited the suggested location for the statue, adjacent to the Potomac River in Potomac Park.

The estimate of $52,000 for the pedestal, which was given to you by Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assistant Superintendent of the office of National Capital Parks, the Commission feel, is correct and reasonable. This is based on the assumption, of course, that a pedestal, similar to the one of the Leif Eiricsson Statue at Reykjavik, Iceland, would be secured, and that the statue would be given a firm foundation including under-pinning since the Potomac Park area consists of reclaimed land.

The problem resolves itself into the question of choosing the above-mentioned location for the statue, or of selecting another site where a much simpler pedestal could be provided, and at a location that would not require under-pinning. In the latter event it might become necessary to place the statue at some distance from the river. This, the Commission feel, would be unfortunate since it is evident that the statue was designed for location at a waterfront.

The Commission have heard informally that there are residents of North Dakota who are heartily in favor of the Potomac Park site; therefore, before taking any further action in the matter of choosing another location, the Commission would be pleased to await further advice from you on the subject.

Hon. Warren C. Magnuson,
The United States Senate,
Washington D. C.

Sincerely yours,
Sgd.
David E. Finley, Chairman.

EXHIBIT F

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

February 28, 1952

Dear Senator Magnuson:

In further reference to my letter of February 1st, I am pleased to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held on February 20, 1952, gave careful consideration to the question of erecting a bronze statue of Leif Ericsson in the City of Washington. The Commission also visited the suggested location for the statue, adjacent to the Potomac River in Potomac Park.

The estimate of $52,000 for the pedestal, which was given to you by Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Assistant Superintendent of the office of National Capital Parks, the Commission feel, is correct and reasonable. This is based on the assumption, of course, that a pedestal, similar to the one of the Leif Ericsson Statue at Reykjavik, Iceland, would be secured, and that the statue would be given a firm foundation including under-pinning since the Potomac Park area consists of reclaimed land.

The problem resolves itself into the question of choosing the above-mentioned location for the statue, or of selecting another site where a much simpler pedestal could be provided, and at a location that would not require under-pinning. In the latter event it might become necessary to place the statue at some distance from the river. This, the Commission feel, would be unfortunate since it is evident that the statue was designed for location at a waterfront.

The Commission have heard informally that there are residents of North Dakota who are heartily in favor of the Potomac Park site; therefore, before taking any further action in the matter of choosing another location, the Commission would be pleased to await further advice from you on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

The United States Senate,
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,

UNITED STATES SENATE

Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce

March 6, 1952

Mr. David E. Finley
Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

Relative to your letter of February 28, I am informing the Commission of Fine Arts that I feel that the Potomac Park site for the Leif Eiricsson statue is the best. I am planning to continue my efforts to obtain the necessary funds for the foundation. I am, of course, unable to predict when we may be successful in obtaining this money.

Very truly yours,

Sgd.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S.S.

WGM:Qs

EXHIBIT F-1

LETTERS CONCERNING NOTES TO BE SENT LATER

H. R. 6759
H. R. 6747
H. R. 6736

EXHIBIT G

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6166

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 22, 1952

Mr. KEARNS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the General Services Administration.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended and unobligated balance of the funds which were appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for the use of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission shall, upon the expiration of such Commission on December 31, 1952, be transferred and made available to the General Services Administration to establish, maintain, and administer a suitable theater and opera house

as a National War Memorial in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, the plans to be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts.

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6166

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the General Services Administration.

By Mr. KEARNS

JANUARY 22, 1952
Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6141

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 21, 1952

Mr. WIER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended and unobligated balance of the funds which were appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for the use of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission shall, upon the expiration of such Commission on December 31, 1952, be transferred and made available to the Commission of Fine Arts for expenditure by the National War Memorial Arts Commission in carrying out section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts", approved May 17, 1910, as amended.

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6141

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts.

By Mr. WIER

JANUARY 21, 1952

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6158

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 22, 1952

Mr. CELLER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended and unobligated balance of the funds which were appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for the use of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission shall, upon the expiration of such Commission on December 31, 1952, be transferred and made available to the General Services Administration to establish, maintain, and administer (in accordance with plans to be

approved by the Commission of Fine Arts) a suitable theater and opera house as a National World War II Memorial in the city of Washington, District of Columbia.

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 6158

A BILL

To provide for the transfer of certain funds from the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts.

By Mr. CELLER

JANUARY 22, 1952
Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

March 4, 1952

My dear Senator O'Mahoney:

The Bureau of the Budget has referred to The Commission of Fine Arts a copy of a letter, addressed to you on February 18, 1952, reporting on S. 1712, a bill "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove." I brought this correspondence to the attention of the Commission at a meeting held on February 26, 1952.

The Commission took note of the fact that the question of the designation of the trees, adjacent to the Memorial Avenue, as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, is to be left to determination by the Congress. The Commission's views on this subject were set forth in a letter addressed to the Bureau of the Budget on July 30, 1951, of which I enclose an extract. The Commission hopes that its views in this matter will be sustained by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney
The United States Senate
Washington D. C.

cc to : Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts.

def/f

EXHIBIT H

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

March 4, 1952

My dear Senator O'Mahoney:

The Bureau of the Budget has referred to The Commission of Fine Arts a copy of a letter, addressed to you on February 18, 1952, reporting on S. 1712, a bill "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptured piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove." I brought this correspondence to the attention of the Commission at a meeting held on February 26, 1952.

The Commission took note of the fact that the question of the designation of the trees, adjacent to the Memorial Avenue, as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, is to be left to determination by the Congress. The Commission's views on this subject were set forth in a letter addressed to the Bureau of the Budget on July 31, 1951, of which I enclose an extract. The Commission hopes that its views in this matter will be sustained by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney
The United States Senate
Washington D. C.

cc to : Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts.

def\f

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

EXTRACT COPY July 30, 1951

Dear Mr. Jones:

At a meeting held on July 19, 1951, the Commission of Fine Arts considered Senate Bill 1712, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the sculptural piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Grove."

*****

With regard to the designation of the trees adjacent to the Memorial Avenue as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, the Commission again calls attention to the fact that this land is planned for inclusion in the Arlington National Cemetery. The management of the Cemetery would find it inconvenient, the Commission believes, to have part of its land already dedicated as a memorial to a particularly historic figure.

The members of the Commission appreciate the patriotic motives of the sponsoring organization and are aware of the desirability of having, in the National Capital, memorials to the great men of history. There ought, however, to be an expression of order and propriety in the location of such memorials. The Arlington Memorial Bridge is a monument to the unity of the North and the South; its axis connects the Lincoln Memorial and the Lee Mansion. If there are any monuments along this line, they should be dedicated to all the nation's fallen heroes, without special identification of time or place.

There are many places appropriate for memorials to those who fell in particular theaters of action. And there are locations suited to honoring famous men. The Columbus Monument, in front of Union Station and facing the United States Capitol, is a conspicuous demonstration of the city's regard for the great explorer.

Therefore, the Commission feels it its duty to advise against the adoption of Senate Bill 1712.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Hon. Roger W. Jones
Bureau of the Budget
Washington D. C.

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

EXTRACT COPY July 30, 1952

Dear Mr. Jones:

At a meeting held on July 30, 1952, the Commission of Fine Arts considered Senate Bill 3112, "To provide for the erection at the Memorial Avenue entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery of the equestrian piece known as The Last Farewell, and for the establishment of the Christopher Columbus Grove."

*****

With regard to the designation of the trees adjacent to the Memorial Avenue as the Christopher Columbus Memorial Grove, the Commission again calls attention to the fact that this land is planned for inclusion in the Arlington National Cemetery. The management of the Cemetery would find it inconvenient, the Commission believes, to have part of the land already dedicated as a memorial to a particularly historic figure.

The members of the Commission appreciate the patriotic motives of the sponsoring organization and are aware of the desirability of having, in the National Capital, memorials to the great men of history. There ought, however, to be an expression of order and propriety in the location of such memorials. The Arlington Memorial Bridge is a monument to the unity of the North and the South; its axis connects the Lincoln Memorial and the Lee Mansion. If there are any monuments along this line, they should be dedicated to all the nation's valiant heroes, without special identification of time or place.

There are many places appropriate for memorials to those who fell in particular theaters of action. And there are locations suited to honoring famous men. The Jefferson Memorial, in front of Union Station and facing the United States Capitol, is a conspicuous demonstration of the city's regard for the great explorer.

Therefore, the Commission feels it its duty to advise against the adoption of Senate Bill 3112.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Hon. Roger W. Jones
Bureau of the Budget
Washington D. C.

Irvin L. Hurley
Chairman

bgd.

UNITED STATES SENATE

Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

March 12, 1952

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

As you know, the Committee has received a favorable, if amended, report from the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1712. As yet we have not had a report from the Department of the Interior. You may be assured that the Committee will give careful consideration to the objections of your Commission when the bill is before us for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Joseph C. O'Mahoney
Chairman

O'M:mm

EXHIBIT H-1

UNITED STATES SENATE

Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs

March 12, 1952

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

As you know, the Committee has received a favorable, if amended, report from the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1712. As yet we have not had a report from the Department of the Interior. You may be assured that the Committee will give careful consideration to the objections of your Commission when the bill is before us for consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph C. O'Mahoney
Chairman

C'M:mm

Encl. H-1

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington D. C.

March 3, 1952

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held on February 26, 1952, considered the photograph which you presented of a revised design for the pedestal of the statue, "The Last Farewell," to be placed in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission were not at all satisfied with the design and disapproved it. Instead of a circular (fluted) pedestal, which has the appearance of a portion of a column, or drum, the Commission felt that a simple rectangular pedestal would be much better in appearance. Also, the Commission believe it would improve the appearance of the statue and pedestal if the fountain basin be omitted; and that there be less cloud extension.

The Commission considered the samples of black granite which you presented. Mount Airy granite has also been suggested. This matter is to have further consideration on the submission of a revised design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent,
National Capital Parks, National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT I

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington 25, D. C.

March 3, 1952

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held on February 26, 1952, considered the photograph which you presented of a revised design for the pedestal of the statue, "The Last Farewell," to be placed in the niche of the Great Entrance to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Commission were not at all satisfied with the design and disapproved it. Instead of a circular (fluted) pedestal, which has the appearance of a portion of a column, or drum, the Commission felt that a simple rectangular pedestal would be much better in appearance. Also, the Commission believe it would improve the appearance of the statue and pedestal if the fountain basin be omitted; and that there be less cloud extension.

The Commission considered the samples of black granite which you presented. Mount Airy granite has also been suggested. This matter is to have further consideration on the substitution of a revised design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Secretary.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent,
National Capital Parks, National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT I

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF PEDESTAL FOR "LAST FAREWELL" - February 26, 1952

Mr. THOMPSON: I have here, what I believe to be a proper follow up of your request of last time, to give you a sample of the kind of base and here is a letter of which I have a copy for you, signed by Mr. Weinman. Here is a picture in which he and Mr. Smith have tried to capture the thoughts and you can pass those around.

Perhaps we ought to read the letter, Mr. Finley.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Why don't you read the letter?

MR. THOMPSON: This is a letter from Mr. Weinman to me in which he says:

"I have today finished and colored the new pedestal for "The Last Farewell" statue and am pleased to say that the new arrangement of pedestal and statue is a decided improvement over the former pedestals. It is in the "Drum"design suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, and I have colored it a varigated black granite, which harmonizes very well with the green patina over gold leaf suggested by the Commission.

"In addition to this, I have restudied and enlarged the cloud motif between statue and pedestal, which adds greatly to the general composition. I had hoped to send you a kodachrome showing color arrangement and its general effect in the niche, but find that I cannot get this to you in time for the meeting on the 26th, so I am sending you a black and white photograph instead for presentation to the Commission.

"I will send you tomorrow two black granite samples requested by the Commission. The small sample "Black Pearl" I have used on a memorial and found it an excellent granite. The larger sample "Cordova Black" seems too fine grained and monotonous in color.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF PEDESTAL FOR "LAST FAREWELL" - February 25, 1932

Mr. THOMPSON: I have here, what I believe to be a proper follow up of your request of last time, to give you a sample of the kind of base and here is a letter of which I have a copy for you, signed by Mr. Heiman. Here is a picture in which he and Mr. Smith have tried to capture the thoughts and you can pass those around.

Perhaps we ought to read the letter, Mr. Finley.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Why don't you read the letter?

MR. THOMPSON: This is a letter from Mr. Heiman to me in which he says:

"I have today finished and colored the new pedestal for "The Last Farewell" statue and am pleased to say that the new arrangement of pedestal and statue is a decided improvement over the former pedestals. It is in the "Bronze" design suggested by the Fine Arts Commission, and I have colored it a variegated Black granite, which harmonizes very well with the green patina over gold leaf suggested by the Commission.

"In addition to this, I have restudied and enlarged the flood motif between statue and pedestal, which adds greatly to the general composition. I had hoped to send you a photograph showing color arrangement and its general effect in the niche, but find that I cannot get this to you in time for the meeting on the 26th, so I am sending you a black and white photograph intended for presentation to the Commission.

"I will send you tomorrow two black granite samples requested by the Commission. The small sample "Black Pearl" I have used on a memorial and found it an excellent granite. The larger sample "Dordova Black" seems too fine grained and monotonous in color.

"Recalling the fact that there has been a question about the symbolism embodied in the "Last Farewell" statue, I would briefly state the following:

'In my sketch model, as well as in the larger Working Model for the statue "The Last Farewell" I have endeavored to create a spirit of solemnity befitting the occasion of the burial of one of the Nation's members of the Armed Forces. The figure of the departed soldier, having made the supreme sacrifice in the fullness of his powers, stands partly enveloped in his shroud, his shield over his back, his sheathed sword pressed to his side and his right hand raised in silent salute to his departing comrade in arms.'

"Trusting the Commission will find it possible to take definite action in the related matters of statue and pedestal and with due appreciation of your untiring efforts to reach a final solution of this long delayed project, I am

"Sincerely yours,

/s/ A. A. Weinman"

MR. CAEMMERER: Do you have a design for that pedestal, a revised design for the pedestal?

MR. THOMPSON: It is reflected here in these photographs, Mr. Caemmerer.

I do have downstairs in my office some drawings that show the pedestal or drum both unfluted or fluted. With me, I only have the pictures of the fluted design. This shows it much better than the drawing. I thought that this photograph would do to show the effect of what the sculptor and architect were driving at. I have just brought along the photographs. The design with flutes seems to be the one that Mr. Weinman and Mr. Smith prefer. That is a sample of granite that Mr. Weinman thinks would be appropriate. Following Mr. deWeldon's thought, he has chosen the colored granite as you have suggested, with the green patina over the gold on the sculptured figure. His letter said he thought it looked very handsome.

"Recalling the fact that there has been a question about the symbolism embodied in the "Last Farewell" statue, I would briefly state the following:

'In my sketch model, as well as in the larger working model for the statue "The Last Farewell" I have endeavored to create a spirit of solemnity befitting the occasion of the burial of one of the Nation's members of the Armed Forces. The figure of the departed soldier, having made the supreme sacrifice in the fullness of his power, stands quietly enveloped in his shroud, the shield over his back, his obsolete sword pressed to his side and his right hand raised in silent salute to his departing comrade in arms.'

"Trusting the Commission will find it possible to take definite action in the related matters of statue and pedestal and with the appreciation of your unstinting efforts to reach a final solution of this long delayed project, I am

"Sincerely yours,

/s/ A. A. Weinman"

MR. DAMMANN: Do you have a design for what pedestal, a revised design for the pedestal?

MR. THOMPSON: It is reflected here in these photographs, Mr. Dammann. I do have downstairs in my office some drawings which show the pedestal or show both unfluted or fluted. With me, I only have the pictures of the fluted design. This shows it much better than the drawing. I thought this photograph would do to show the effect of what the sculptor and architect were driving at. I have just brought along the photographs. The result with flutes seems to be the one that Mr. Weinman and Mr. Reid prefer. That is a sample of granite that Mr. Weinman thinks would be acceptable. Following Mr. Dallerson's thought, he has chosen the colored granite as you have suggested, with the green veins over the gold on the sculptured figure. His letter said he thought it looked very handsome.

MR. PEETS: The pedestal comes up from water; this is a pool here. The water does not show in these photographs fully. If you did, you would see less of the line.

MR THOMPSON: The rest of the base.

MR. PEETS: The line where the base comes out of the water.

MR. BELLUXCHI: You see less but it looks like you see more because of the reflection.

MR PEETS: That is true. It would be distinguishable.

MR. BELLUSCHI: And would make it have ineffective shape.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Going into the water, you mean. This fountain is not a suitable thing for a statue of this kind. I think it is rather solemnstatue to be coming out of a pool of water. I was wondering if the plain floor — the fountain has a rather gay note to it that I don't associate with a statue of this kind.

MR. PEETS: How about the scale of the pedestal in relation to the scale of the niche?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am very unhappy about it.

MR. THOMPSON: I can't tell you any more about it than can be observed in the photograph and sample of granite. I have received the photographs and the letter of transmittal. I am now passing it on to you with the thought that the sculptor has tried to reflect the suggestions of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is about a six-foot pedestal.

MR. THOMPSON: A little more. I should say it is nearer eight feet from the scale of the men on the side.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Thompson, the niche has been cleared of those dark marble panels.

MR. THOMPSON: This is a plaster model and the medallions have not been colored. I think that the suggestion of removing the color from the niche is

MR. PEETS: The pedestal comes up from water; this is a pool here. The water does not show in these photographs fully. If you did, you would see legs or the like.

MR THOMPSON: The rest of the base.

MR. PEETS: The line where the base comes out of the water.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You see legs but it looks like you see more because of the reflection.

MR PEETS: That is true. It would be distinguishable.

MR. BELLUSCHI: And would make it have ineffective shape.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Going into the water, you mean. This fountain is not a suitable thing for a statue of this kind. I think it is rather plain floor -- the fountain has a rather gay note to it that I don't associate with a statue of this kind.

MR. PEETS: How about the scale of the pedestal in relation to the scale of the niche?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am very unhappy about it.

MR. THOMPSON: I can't tell you any more about it than can be observed in the photograph and sample of granite. I have received the photographs and the letter of transmittal. I am now passing it on to you with the thought that the sculptor has tried to reflect the suggestions of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is about a six-foot pedestal.

MR. THOMPSON: A little more. I should say it is nearer eight feet from the scale of the man on the side.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Thompson, the niche has been cleared of those dark marble panels.

MR. THOMPSON: This is a plaster model and the modifications have not been colored. I think that the suggestion of removing the color from the niche is

probably a good idea because it doesn't conflict with the silhouette.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That will be done.

MR. THOMPSON: I think that is the intention, to eventually clear away the red medallion of red marble.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And these columns.

MR. THOMPSON: It is all in one key and one color, which I think is an improvement.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How about this?

MR. THOMPSON: That is there, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Don't you think it would be possible to floor the pedestal?

MR. THOMPSON: It would be.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it is a rather solemn motif.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Mr. Thompson, do those two things that look like dishes, are they granite?

MR. THOMPSON: I believe they are a part of the bronze statue.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They were not there before.

MR. THOMPSON: Something that Mr. deWeldon was asking about, and I am presuming is that, that the horizontal element above the granite base is a transition member that was thought advisable.

MR. deWELDON: I was asking if it was used for the water to come out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am opposed to water at all. I really think it has nothing to do with the fountain. I am perfectly willing to have the fountain there and put the statue in some other place but they don't go together.

MR. THOMPSON: This study is exactly in the same relation to the niche as it was when we had the large montage mounted some two months ago.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Gentlemen, have you any suggestions about the pedestal as to any improvements you might want to suggest?

probably a good idea because it doesn't conflict with the silhouette.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That will be done.

MR. THOMPSON: I think that is the intention, to eventually clear away the red modelling of red marble.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And these columns.

MR. THOMPSON: It is all in one key and one color, which I think is an improvement.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How about this?

MR. THOMPSON: That is there, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Don't you think it would be possible to floor the pedway?

MR. THOMPSON: It would be.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think it is a rather nice motif.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Mr. Thompson, do those two things that look like drains are they granite?

MR. THOMPSON: I believe they are a part of the bronze creature.

MR. BELLUSCHI: They were not there before.

MR. THOMPSON: Something that Mr. Castellon was asking about, and I am presuming is that, that the horizontal element above the granite case is a transition member that was thought advisable.

MR. CASTELLON: I was asking if it was used for the water to come out.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I am opposed to water at all. I really think it has nothing to do with the fountain. I am perfectly willing to have the fountain there and put the statue in some other place but they don't go together.

MR. THOMPSON: This study is exactly in the same relation to the niche as it was when we had the large pendage mounted over two months ago.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Gentlemen, have you any suggestions about the proposal to do any improvements you might want to suggest?

First, could I ask this question, do you or don't you agree that it would be better to have the pedestal placed on a floor, not with water surrounding it? It might change the character of the pedestal somewhat. What do you feel about that, by leaving out the feature, the fountain feature of this in the niche?

MR. PEETS: It would mean a complete reconstruction of that low member there, wouldn't it? That is extremely small scale, that varies with the statue.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is completely inappropriate, just the scale of the niche and also the idea of the fountain, with the idea of the statue. I think that the two don't go together. I agree that the elimination of the water would be better, still I think the elimination of the statue would be better than the elimination of the water but that is something that should not even be on the record because we are already not suggesting that. But since the point in question is the pedestal, I would stick my neck out and say I don't think it is entirely an improvement, it is too fussy, too much in competition there. If there is a pedestal, it should be extrevely simple and not resting on water. That is my comment.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How do you feel, Mr. deWeldon?

MR. deWELDON: I feel that it should be much simpler and I don't think the cloud should extend as far as it does here off the figure. I think the flow up sawed in half, such a wide cloud before.

MR. THOMPSON: The cloud is enlarged over the other model.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you a photograph of the model as it was before, when we last saw it?

MR. CAEMMERER: Yes, we have it.

MR. THOMPSON: You think the fluting may be eliminated?

MR. deWELDON: Yes.

First, could I ask this question, do you or don't you agree that it would be better to have the pedestal placed on a floor, not with water surrounding it? It might change the character of the pedestal somewhat. What do you feel about that, by leaving out the feature, the fountain feature of this in the middle?

MR. PRETO: It would mean a complete reconstruction of that low feature there, wouldn't it? That is extremely small scale, that varies with the statue.

MR. DEMIDOCHI: It is completely inappropriate, just the scale of the model and also the idea of the fountain, with the idea of the statue. I think that the two don't go together. I agree that the elimination of the water would be better, still I think the elimination of the statue would be better than the elimination of the water but that is something that should not even be on the record because we are already not suggesting that. But since the point in question is the pedestal, I would object to mask out and say I don't think it is entirely an improvement, it is too fussy, too much in competition there. If there is a pedestal, it should be extremely simple and not reeling on water. That is my comment.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: How do you feel, Mr. Gelfodon?

MR. deMIDDON: I feel that it should be much simpler and I don't think the cloud should extend as far as it does here off the figure. I think the flow up seemed in itself, such a wide cloud before.

MR. THOMPSON: The cloud is enlarged over the other model.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Have you a photograph of the model as it was before, when we last saw it?

MR. CHANDLER: Yes, we have it.

MR. [illegible]: You think the lighting may be eliminated?

MR. GELFODON: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Just a cylinder, nothing else?

It is smaller there.

MR. deWELDON: These wings don't come out as they do now.

MR. THOMPSON: Is that an enlargement of the photograph that was taken at the time the full-size study was placed in the niche?

MR. NEILD: I don't remember that base.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I don't either.

MR. deWELDON: I remember that these things did not come out.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't think we did anything in the way of blow up of the photograph that had that fountain in it.

MR. BELLUSCHI: At least the idea of the fountain, there is a little bit more consistency about the idea of the statue here. At least you have a bowl and supposedly water keeps on falling but I still —

MR. HUDNUT: In this case he is emerging from his bank.

MR. THOMPSON: They have added flutings, which Mr. deWeldon now thinks might better be eliminated, just a cylinder and nothing else.

MR. PEETS: The design was made by Mr. Smith, probably.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Smith and Mr. Weinman in cooperation. Mr. Weinman has been quite ill. Following his return, he has been in bed with pneumonia. He is just now getting back on his feet and in his studio again after two months or more.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the statue is better there without that cloud extending.

MR. deWELDON: I feel if there is a cloud it should go upwards not sideways.

MR. THOMPSON: I can't very well explain beyond what I have already said because you know as much about it as I do. I pass it on to this Commission with the letter, which I have done. I think they were trying to

observe the wishes of the Commission. At least they were following the suggestion of the Commission at the last meeting.

MR. NEILD: This figure is supposed to be extending. When it is planted on a solid conspicuous base, it loses that illusion.

MR. PEETS: I find the diminution in this base the most doubtful factor about it. The upward diminution. It makes it look like a fragment of an old Doric column. The elimination is much grater than we find in such a column. It is reversed. There is the curve and all that.

MR. NEILD: It seems to me the base could recede from the front to some extent to bring it out in the open and not as if it is standing on a block of masonry. Certainly the simpler it is, the better. The base is very conspicuous here and detracts from the statue.

I suggest this be resubmitted for restudy.

MR. PEETS. Did they try a simple rectangular block?

MR. THOMPSON: If they did, I have seen no drawings of it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you think a simple rectangular block would be better, and restudy it along that line?

MR. NEILD: At least a simpler shape.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And go back to that original form without so much cloud extending.

MR. NEILD: I suggest it be restudied and simplified.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think that would be best as a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And say eliminate the fountain.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That it be a consideration because I think it will be a different problem if the fountain is eliminated. I think you will have a little different problem in redesign.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would we want to eliminate the fountain, wouldn't it be better to say so?

be better to say so?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would we want to eliminate the fountain, wouldn't it

little different problem in redesign.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That it be a consideration because I think it will be a different problem if the fountain is eliminated. I think you will have a

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And say eliminate the fountain.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think that would be best as a suggestion.

MR. NEILD: I suggest it be restudied and simplified.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And go back to that original form without so much cloud extending.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you think a simple rectangular block would be better, and restudy it along that line?

MR. NEILD: At least a simpler shape.

MR. THOMPSON: If they did, I have seen no drawings of it.

MR. PEREIRA: Did they try a simple rectangular block?

I suggest this be resubmitted for restudy.

very complicated here and detracts from the statue.

block of masonry. Certainly the simpler it is, the better. The base is some extent to bring it out in the open and not as if it is standing on a

MR. NEILD: It seems to me the base could recede from the front to

column. It is reversed. There is the curve and all that.

old Doric column. The elimination is much greater than we find in such a about it. The upward diminution. It makes it look like a fragment of an

MR. PEREIRA: I find the diminution in this base the most doubtful factor planted on a solid conspicuous base, it loses that illusion.

MR. NEILD: This figure is supposed to be extending. When it is suggestion of the Commission at the last meeting.

observe the wishes of the Commission. At least they were following the

MR. NEILD: I think Mr. Belluschi's remark that the reflection in the water is going to distort this base and emphasize it all the more rather than subdue it, is well taken. Personally, I would be in favor of eliminating water for that reason, if for no other.

MR. PEETS: I think that is sound but it also remains true that the statue will be seen 99 percent of the time, cases, from a considerable distance and I understand that they are working ona planting plan for that large area which will probably in most views create another level, really coming up considerably and that these extremely unfortunate relationships between very low construction here and the monument, the pedestal will be experienced only by relatively small percentage of the observers and will apply only to close-up view.

The situation is certainly difficult in view of the fact that they have made very definite effort to get something good and so far as the fluting is concerned, I may be personally responsible for that because I had in mind at the time I was talking, I believe with Mr. Smith, a pedestal in Cleveland which has flutes. It however, has no dimunition. It is vertical and the flutes are not terminated in the construction in the block as this is. I do not know exactly what the technical expression is —

MR. THOMPSON: A drum of a column?

MR. PEETS: The columns continue up witnout this sculpture treatment. Also the flutings are not like this. There are 22 flutes in a classical column but the ones I have in mind, they were much shallower and much wider so that it was a different thing. It wasn't a drum from a column and this by no means meets my imagination of what it may be. When I was talking with him, the thing I was afraid of myself, I didn't like the idea of the cylinder, plain cylinder because I thought that that would be way out of scale with all the larger scale than anything in the vicinity and it was the idea of breaking

MR. MEIER: I think Mr. Billyeald's remark that the reflection in the water is going to distort this does not emphasize it all the more rather than reduce it, is well taken. Personally, I would be in favor of eliminating water for that reason, if for no other.

MR. PEARS: I think that is sound but it also remains true that the seating will be seen 99 percent of the time, access, from a considerable distance and I understand that they are working one planting plan for each large area which will probably in most views create another level, really coming up considerably and that these extremely unfortunate relationships between very low construction here and the monument, the pedestal will be superimposed only by relatively small percentage of the observers and will apply only to close-up view.

The situation is certainly difficult in view of the fact that they have made very definite effort to get something good and so far as the fluting is concerned, I may be personally responsible for that because I had in mind at the time I was talking, I believe with Mr. Smith, a pedestal in Cleveland which has flutes. It however, has no diminution. It is vertical and the flutes are not terminated in this concentration in the block as this is. I do not know exactly what the technical objection is --

MR. THOMPSON: A drum of a column?

MR. PEARS: The columns continue up without this detailing treatment. Also the fluting are not like this. There are 24 flutes in a classical column but the ones I have in mind, they were much shallower and much wider so that it was a different thing. It wasn't a drum from a column and this by no means meets my imagination of what it may be. When I was talking with him, the thing I was afraid of myself, I didn't like the idea of the cylinder, plain cylinder because I thought that that would be way out of scale with all the larger scale items anything in the vicinity and it was the idea of breaking

that scale that I referred to this example that was fluted. The results of the suggestion was obviously unfortunate.

Would it be better if it were gray and not black: The whole thing as we see it here in the photograph, it is enormously exaggerated in importance in comparison with the civic art factors, in the distant view. Probably gray would tend to make the pedestal disappear and cause the statue to float in air to some extent.

MR. THOMPSON: As I read this, the fluting seems to be two-times the size of conventional fluting on a column. I think it is. I count six, about twelve flutings whereas you would have about twice that many on a conventional number?

MR. PEETS: Isn't 22 the conventional number?

MR. THOMPSON: I think it is and as I follow your comments, —

MR. HUDNUT: I think the pedestal should be the same material as the architecture and should be in harmony with the architecture and should have a touch of classic or tie-in feeling of the background.

MR. THOMPSON: As I followed Mr. Peets I was mentally constructing a section of a pilaster because someone said square, with a conventional number of flutes, shallow flutes rather than deep flutes.

MR. PEETS: That brings in niceties that I think we had better drop the idea of flutes as far as an effort to get unanimity.

MR. THOMPSON: I was trying to capture some of the thoughts expressed here so I would be able to transmit them to the sculptor.

MR. deWELDON: I feel that to use the same granite as used in the architecture would be better because it would convey the idea of the statue floating in air.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Same material —

MR. HUDNUT: Call attention to itself, to the pedestal would disappear in the background all the more so it has some of the character of the back-

that needs that I referred to this example that was lifted. The results of the suggestion was obviously unfortunate.

Would it be better if it were gray and not black: The model thing as we see it here in the photograph, it is enormously exaggerated in importance in comparison with the civic art factors, in the diagram view. Probably grey would tend to make the pedestal disappear and cause the statue to float in air to some extent.

MR. THOMPSON: As I read this, the flutting seems to be two-thirds the size of conventional fluting on a column. I think it is. I count six, about twelve flutings whereas you would have about twice that many on a conventional number?

MR. PEETE: Isn't all the conventional material —

MR. THOMPSON: I think it is and as I follow your comments, —

MR. HUBBUT: I think the pedestal should be the same material as the architecture and should be in harmony with the architecture and should have a touch of classic or tie-in feeling of the background.

MR. THOMPSON: As I followed it. People I was verbally corresponding s section of a pilaster because someone said square, with a conventional number of flutes, shallow flutes rather than deep flutes.

MR. PEETE: That brings in objection that I think we had better omit the idea of flutes as far as an effort to get uncluttered.

MR. THOMPSON: I was trying to capture some of the thoughts expressed here so I would be able to transmit them to the sculptor.

MR. de MILLE: I feel that to use the same granite we used in the architecture would be better because it would convey the idea of the statue floating in air.

MR. SMILLIE: Same material —

MR. HUBBUT: Only objection to ideally, to the material would disappear in the background all the more so it has some of the characteristics of the back-

MR. PEETS: In justice to Mr. Weinman I think that we might talk confidentially — this is the first time it has been suggested that a gray granite pedestal be used.

MR. HUDNUT: But it is a happy thought.

MR. CAEMMERER: The Mt. Airy, same as the bridge.

MR. PEETS: What I mean is —

MR. BELLUSCHI: Not the cast iron part.

MR. PEETS: To remove some of the feeling of sharp criticism on the sequence of design --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we suggested ourselves that we use dark granite.

MR. THOMPSON: I think perhaps you did.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: So we may have been responsible for some of the confusion.

MR. PEETS: The granite there is much darker than this plaster of paris.

MR. THOMPSON: It reads much sharper than the plaster of paris.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Could we say that now that we see the darker granite pedestal that it is too prominent and we would like to have the same granite used as is used in the niche and the idea that it should be a square pedestal.

MR. HUDNUT: I think so. The nearer you can get to this architecture, the better. Could not try to harmonize with the sculpture but with the architectural forms.

MR PEETS: There isn't any larger stone than one of those panels, they are not really structure stones, just veneer.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Just speaking out loud, after all, they are for the architect and the sculpture, whether we would be better to simply say that this not approved rather than give other directions which find ourselves in a position to reject later on.

MR. PEETS: In justice to Mr. Weinman I think that we might talk confidentially -- this is the first time it has been suggested that a gray granite pedestal be used.

MR. HUDNUT: But it is a happy thought.

MR. GARMONDER: The Mr. Airy, same as the bridge.

MR. PEETS: That I mean is --

MR. BELLUSCHI: Not the cast iron part.

MR. PEETS: To remove some of the feeling of sharp criticism on the sequence of design --

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: I think we suggested ourselves that we use dark granite.

MR. THOMPSON: I think perhaps you did.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: So we may have been responsible for some of the confusion.

MR. PEETS: The granite there is much darker than this plaster of paris.

MR. THOMPSON: It reads much sharper than the plaster of paris.

CHAIRMAN FINNEY: Could we say that now that we see the darker granite pedestal that it is too prominent and we would like to have the same granite used as is used in the niche and the idea that it should be a square pedestal.

MR. HUDNUT: I think so. The nearer you can get to this architecture, the better. Could not try to harmonize with the sculpture but with the architectural forms.

MR PEETS: There isn't any larger stone than one of those panels, they are not really structure stones, just veneer.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Just speaking out loud, after all, they are for the architect and the sculpture, whether we would be better to simply say that this not approved rather than give other directions which find ourselves in a position to reject later on.

MR. THOMPSON: It would be most helpful to everyone, if you give them some idea as to what you want.

MR. BELLUSCHI: That could be done unofficially somehow. It seems to me that the question of the fluting had been suggested here, the question of the dark granite has also been suggested here, and we find ourselves in position --

MR. HUDNUT: You can quote individual members without the Commission's being in position --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Please ask to have it restudied and have Mr. Thompson privately convey the ideas.

MR. THOMPSON: I could say then that your official action is disapproval or whatever action you take. I would like, however, someway of getting to Mr. Weinman the thought that you have expressed here; some opinions that seem to reflect general agreement, at least for the moment. Maybe the base ought to be of the same material as the material that is in the background: And it seems to be general thought at least suggested, that instead of round, perhaps it ought to be square.

MR. NEILD: At lease simplified in design.

MR. BELLUSCHI: We are agreed on that. That partakes of the statue itself and adds to the bulkiness and instead of disappearing into the background, it stands out and asserts itself too strongly. So by making it the same color and unobtrusive and simple design the same color as the background, you obtain that point of making tha statue continuous and not the addition.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you want that mentioned, the matter of the fountain?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I think that could be mentioned as an individual problem, yes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: They may come back with the fountain still there and we would have to consider this again. If we like the fountain, let us say nothing

MR. THOMPSON: It would be most helpful to everyone, if you give them some idea as to what you want.

MR. BRILUSKI: That could be done unofficially somehow. It seems to me that the question of the flushing had been suggested here, the question of the dark granite has also been suggested here, and we find ourselves in position --

MR. HUNTUT: You can quote individual members without the Commission's being in position --

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Please ask to have it recorded and have Mr. Thompson privately convey the ideas.

MR. THOMPSON: I could say then that your official action is disapproval or whatever action you take. I would like, however, someway of getting to Mr. Heiman the thought that you have expressed here; some opinions that seem to reflect general agreement, at least for the moment. Maybe the base ought to be of the same material as the material that is in the background: And it seems to be general thought at least suggested, that instead of round, perhaps it ought to be square.

MR. NEIL: At least simplified in design.

MR. BRILUSKI: We are agreed on that. That partakes of the statue itself can adds to the boldness and instead of disappearing into the background it stands out and asserts itself too strongly. So by making it the same color and unobtrusive and simple design the same color as the background, you obtain that point of making the statue continuous and not the contrast.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Do you want that mentioned, the matter of the fountain?

MR. BRILUSKI: I think that could be mentioned as an individual problem, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FINLEY: They may come back with the fountain still there and we would have to consider this again. If we like the fountain, let us say nothing

about it, but if we don't like it --

MR. NEILD: Suggest that we omit the water.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so. I think it is incongruous to marry a fountain with this kind of a statue.

MR. BELLUSCHI: As a matter of fact, I think the fountain there would be more appropriate than the statue, and the fountain I think you could add and finish the spacious way, bring it forward and create a little gayety and bubble which will create the kind of lightness which will go well with the background.

Now the idea of the fountain is there and the statue is there and background is there and they simply don't mix. That is why there is such a hesitancy on anybody's part to say really that if you make a pedestal at all it is going to be all right. I don't think it is going to be all right. If you eliminate the fountain, it still is not going to be all right -- and the other things.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would much rather see a fountain there and no statue but we are committed to the statue. So, therefore, don't let us try to have both statue and fountain in the same niche.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If you study the problem and the facts already established, that the statue is going to be there and therefore the fountain seems to be superfluous addition to the combination.

MR. PEETS. I think an average gardener if he were confronted with a pool for which he had no water would fill it up with white gravel or something like that, near the surface. Don't you think that is one way to do it?

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is as pleasant as can be with that type of architecture, creates a sort of third dimension which you don't have otherwise. You eliminate that and perhaps you can do it by changing material or coming out in some other way but it would look rather funny to have this come up, out

about it, but if we don't like it --

MR. REID: Suggest that we omit the water.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think so. I think it is incongruous to marry a fountain with this kind of a statue.

MR. BELLUSCHI: As a matter of fact, I think the fountain there would be more appropriate than the statue, and the fountain I think you could add and finish the spacious way, bring it forward and create a little society and people which will create the kind of lightness which will go well with the background.

Now the idea of the fountain is there and the statue is there and background is there and they simply don't mix. That is why there is such a hesitancy on anybody's part to say really that if you make a pellssal at all it is going to be all right. I don't think it is going to be all right. If you eliminate the fountain, it still is not going to be all right -- and the other things.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would much rather see a fountain there and no statue but we are committed to the statue. So, therefore, don't let us try to have both statue and fountain in the same niche.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If you study the problem and the laws already established, that the statue is going to be there and therefore the fountain seems to be superfluous addition to the combination.

MR. REID: I think an average gardener if he were confronted with a pool for which he had no water would fill it up with white gravel or something like that, near the surface. Don't you think that is one way to do it?

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is as ghastly as can be with that type of architecture, create a sort of third dimension which you don't have otherwise. You eliminate that and perhaps you can do it by arranging material or cutting out

and say that you have gravel back of it.

MR. PEETS: I meant just fill in back of this curve here, fill in with the gravel and the pedestal would come right out of the ground. That is a subterfuge. But that solid block of granite in that place from any near view is going to look about as silly as anything could be because it is going to be vastly different in scale from all this construction. But I consider that fairly unimportant. In that gravel you could plant a north English ivy.

MR. BELLUSCHI: And have it climb over the statue.

MR. PEETS: Pull it over the legs of the statue occasionally and with this charming garden, we expect from those views will be fairly innocuous.

MR. HUDNUT: I think the best idea is the ivy.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Mr. Thompson, do you think you have a clear conception of the views of the Commission?

MR. THOMPSON: No, I don't. I am slightly confused. I thought I had, and I got the impression that there seemed to be general agreement that, perhaps the cloud was just as happy in its originally small size.

At least that was the thought that Mr. deWeldon expressed. I made a note of that to reduce the cloud to its original size. Then the thought was expressed that we use a light granite material for the base and that we simplify it and by simplify it, I take it to mean a square block rather than circular block, so that it stacks up now as a square block of granite underneath the pedestal with the cloud reduced and as I understand it seems to be the concensus of several here not to use flutes.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: And eliminate the fountain.

MR. THOMPSON: To do away with the water.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Fill it or pave it like the other pavement there or fill it up with pebbles or something. I should expect paving it would be handsomer like the surrounding.

MR. PEETS: As if it were all platform. I am not sure that that coping or a little wall in front is a detail that suggests that. It certainly looks like a fountain detail. It isn't a serious matter. Most views are going to be half a mile away.

Mr. THOMPSON: It is most exceptional that anyone walks down here. It is always in a car entourage that people would see it.

I think I have the general, at least individually expressed thoughts as I have listened to them here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then we will have another session, perhaps at the next meeting.

MR. THOMPSON: You want Mr. Weinman to try to capture the ideas you have expressed, and that I will send him personally. You can take whatever official action without making officially any suggestions?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We appreciate the sketch that he has made in trying to carry out some of these suggestions but feel they should be restudied further and without regard to the fountain, as he has had in mind before.

MR. THOMPSON: I will give him your unofficial views, and try to explain in my own words, if that meets with your approval.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is what the Commission wants.

MR. PRETO: As if it were all platform. I am not sure that copying or a little wall in front is a detail that suggests that. It certainly looks like a fountain detail. It isn't a serious matter. Most views are going to be half a mile away.

MR. THOMPSON: It is most exceptional that anyone walks down here. It is always in a car entourage that people would see it.

I think I have the general, at least individually expressed thoughts as I have listened to them here.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Then we will have another session, perhaps at the next meeting.

MR. THOMPSON: You want Mr. Neiman to try to capture the ideas you have expressed, and that I will send him personally. You can take whatever official action without making officially any suggestions?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We appreciate the sketch that he has made in trying to carry out some of these suggestions but feel they should be resurdied further and without regard to the fountain, as he has had in mind before.

MR. THOMPSON: I will give him your unofficial views, and try to explain in my own words, if that meets with your approval.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is what the Commission wants.

MIMEOGRAPHS CONCERNING MR. HARRY T THOMPSON'S DISCUSSION ON "THE LAST FAREWELL" TO BE ADDED LATER

EXHIBIT I-1

EXHIBIT I-J

MIMEOGRAPHS CONCERNING MR MINDERMAN'S DISCUSSION ON RADIE AND TELEVISION TO BE SENT LATER

EXHIBIT J

GOVERNMENT AND ART

A Report to the President

by the

National Commission of Fine Arts

I Introduction.

a) The Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission of Fine Arts.

b) Its Present Composition.

c) The Mandate of the President.

II The Summary of Testimony.

a) How Art is Handled and Applied by Departments, Agencies, and Bureaus of the Federal Government.

1) General Services Administration - Messrs. Larson and Underwood.

2) Smithsonian Institution - Messrs. Graf, Pope and Beggs.

3) Library of Congress - Messrs. Evans and Waters.

4) The Treasury - The Mint, Mrs. Ross - the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Mr. McLeod.

5) The Post Office - Mr. Fellers.

6) Department of the Interior - National Park Service, Mr. Lee - Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Miss Bonebrake.

7) Federal Security Agency - Miss Goodykoontz and Mr. Randall

8) Veterans Administration - Mr. Talbott

9) Department of Defense:

a) The Army - Gen. Ward, Col. Hutton, Lt. Col. Davenport, Dr. Gunn, Mrs. Nowlin, and Mr. DuBois.

b) The Navy - Adm. Heffernan, Lt. Col. Scott, and Lt. Zumbrun.

c) The Air Force - Maj. Sims.

10) The State Department - Messrs. Larkin and King.

11) The National Gallery of Art - Mr. Finley.

b) How International Cultural Exchange is Handled by the U. S. and Other Governments.

1) The State Department - Dr. Johnstone.

2) The United Kingdom - Mr. Glemser, The British Embassy.

GOVERNMENT AND ART

A Report to the President

by the

National Commission of Fine Arts

I Introduction.

a) The Authority and Responsibilities of the Commission of Fine Arts.

b) The Present Composition.

c) The Mandate of the President.

II The Summary of Testimony.

a) How Art is Handled and Applied by Departments, Agencies, and Bureaus of the Federal Government.

1) General Services Administration - Messrs. Larson and Underwood.

2) Smithsonian Institution - Messrs. Oral, Pope and Beggs.

3) Library of Congress - Messrs. Evans and Waters.

4) The Treasury - The Mint, Mrs. Ross - the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Mr. Mcleod.

5) The Post Office - Mr. Fellers.

6) Department of the Interior - National Park Service, Mr. Lee - Indian Arts and Crafts Board, Miss Bonebrake.

7) Federal Security Agency - Miss Goodykoontz and Mr. Randall

8) Veterans Administration - Mr. Talbott

9) Department of Defense:

a) The Army - Gen. Ward, Col. Hutton, Lt. Col. Davenport, Dr. Gunn, Mrs. Nowlin, and Mr. Pecora.

b) The Navy - Adm. Heffernan, Lt. Col. Scott, and Lt. Sunburn.

c) The Air Force - Maj. Sims.

10) The State Department - Messrs. Larkin and King.

11) The National Gallery of Art - Mr. Finley.

b) How International Cultural Exchange is Handled by the U. S. and Other Governments.

1) The State Department - Dr. Johnstone.

2) The United Kingdom - Mr. Clemson, The British Embassy.

3) The French Republic - M. de Messieres, The French Embassy.

4) The Republic of Mexico - Mr. Aveleyra, The Mexican Embassy.

5) The United States of Brazil - Mr. Vasconcellos, The Brazilian Embassy.

c) The Views of Various Private Institutions and Associations in the Field of Fine Arts.

1) The Committee on Government and Art - Mr. Goodrich.

2) American Federation of Arts - Mr. d'Harnoncourt.

3) American Institute of Architects - Mr. Walker.

4) American Institute of Decorators - Miss McClelland.

5) Association of Art Museum Directors - Mr. Ritchie.

6) College Art Association of America - Mr. Hope.

7) National Association of Women Artists - Miss Yates.

8) National Institute of Arts and Letters - Mr. Kroll.

9) National Society of Mural Painters - Mr. Juta.

10) The Architectural League of New York - Mr. Juta.

11) The Sculptors Guild, Inc. - Mr. Zorach.

12) American Institute of Decorators - Miss Hendricks.

13) The National Sculpture Society - Mr. Wheeler Williams, Mr. Brinckerhoff.

III Report of State and Municipal Art Commissions, H. P. Caemmerer.

IV General Summation of Testimony on Art in Government Agencies.

V General Summation of Testimony on International Cultural Exchange.

VI Conclusion. (To be written by the Commission)
a) On Art in Government Agencies.
b) On International Cultural Exchange.

VII Recommendations. (To be written by the Commission)
a) On Art in Government Agencies.
b) On International Cultural Exchange.

3) The French Republic - M. de Besteiro, The French Embassy.

4) The Republic of Mexico - Mr. Avelaire, The Mexican Embassy.

5) The United States of Brazil - Mr. Veseoncellos, The Brazilian Embassy.

c) The Views of Various Private Institutions and Associations in the Field of Fine Arts.

1) The Committee on Government and Art - Mr. Goodrich.

2) American Federation of Arts - Mr. d'Harnoncourt.

3) American Institute of Architects - Mr. Walker.

4) American Institute of Decorators - Miss McClelland.

5) Association of Art Museum Directors - Mr. Mitchell.

6) College Art Association of America - Mr. Hope.

7) National Association of Women Artists - Miss Yaley.

8) National Institute of Arts and Letters - Mr. Frost.

9) National Society of Mural Painters - Mr. Dute.

10) The Architectural League of New York - Mr. Dute.

11) The Sculptors Guild, Inc. - Mr. Zorach.

12) American Institute of Decorators - Miss Hamblin.

13) The National Sculpture Society - Mr. Wheeler Williams.
Mr. Brinckerhoff.

III Report of State and Municipal Art Commissions, H. P. Caemmerer.

IV General Summation of Testimony on Art in Government Agencies.

V General Summation of Testimony on International Cultural Exchange.

VI Conclusion. (To be written by the Commission)
a) On Art in Government Agencies.
b) On International Cultural Exchange.

VII Recommendations. (To be written by the Commission)
a) On Art in Government Agencies.
b) On International Cultural Exchange.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 27, 1952

Dear Colonel Clearwater:

In accordance with your request of February 1st (QMGMC 293.8 Arlington N/C), the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 26, 1952, considered the question of relocation of the boxwood hedge, flanking the main entrance to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, and inspected the site in company with Lieutenant Colonel James F. Watt and Mr. Charles J. Dorman of your Office.

The Commission approve the drawing submitted for relocation of the hedge with the suggestion that the hedge be replanted as indicated on the accompanying design, so as to be slightly to the west of your proposed location of the hedge (shown in red).

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Colonel James B. Clearwater, QMC,
Chief, Memorial Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Department of the Army,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT L

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 27, 1952

Dear Colonel Clearwater:

In accordance with your request of February 1st (ANSCO 293.8 Arlington M/O), the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 26, 1952, considered the question of relocation of the boxwood hedge, flanking the main entrance to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, and inspected the site in company with Lieutenant Colonel James P. Nott and Mr. Charles L. Dorman of your office.

The Commission approve the drawing submitted for relocation of the hedge with the suggestion that the hedges be replanted as indicated on the accompanying design, so as to be slightly to the west of your proposed location of the hedge (shown in red).

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Colonel James P. Clearwater, CEC,
Chief, Memorial Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Department of the Army,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT I

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 27, 1952

Dear Dr. Wright:

The Commission of Fine Arts were pleased to consider with you, at a meeting held on February 26th, the problem you have in hand, to fill in with masonry certain windows on the inner court of The Folger Library opening out on the parking lot.

The Commission approve the suggestion as set forth in your letter of February 13th, but recommend that the steel grilled bars that are over the window spaces be omitted since they would not provide added protection.

Doubtless, your contractor knows that to allow some air space between the brick masonry will prevent moisture on the interior wall and thus give added protection to the books.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director,
The Folger Shakespeare Library,
Washington 3, D. C.

EXHIBIT M

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

February 27, 1952

Dear Dr. Wright:

The Commission of Fine Arts were pleased to consider with you, at a meeting held on February 26th, the problem you have in mind, to fill in with masonry certain windows on the inner court of The Folger Library opening out on the parking lot.

The Commission approve the suggestion as set forth in your letter of February 13th, but recommend that the steel grilled bars that are over the window spaces be omitted since they would not provide added protection.

Doubtless, your contractor knows that to allow some air space between the brick masonry will prevent moisture on the interior wall and thus give added protection to the books.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,

Chairman.

Dr. Louis B. Wright, Director,
The Folger Shakespeare Library,
Washington 3, D. C.

EXHIBIT M

[Public Law 703—81st Congress]

[Chapter 726—2d Session]

[H. J. Res. 21]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To provide for the utilization of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray (1) the Civil War, (2) the Spanish-American War, and (3) the birth of aviation in the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Joint Committee on the Library is authorized and directed to provide for the utilization of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol, including the small isolated section added in 1917–1918, to complete the history up to the beginning of the twentieth century, including the portrayal of (1) the Civil War, (2) the Spanish-American War, and (3) the birth of aviation in the United States. Approximately ten feet of said unfinished portion next to the portrayal of "Landing of Columbus" shall be used to portray the birth of aviation in the United States. The remainder of said unfinished portion shall be used for the portrayal of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. For that purpose the joint committee shall select a design, depicting such events, and shall employ such artist or artists as may demonstrate to the satisfaction of the joint committee ability to perform the work in a proper manner.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

Approved August 17, 1950.

EXHIBIT N

EXHIBIT M

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

February 20, 1952

MEMORANDUM TO: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Lynn has received an inquiry from Senator Green with reference to completing the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol, as authorized by Public Law 703 of the 81st Congress.

Mr. John Walker, Chief Curator of the National Gallery, recommends that Mr. Allyn Cox, 135 E. 40th Street, New York, be considered for this work. Mr. Cox studied at the National Academy of Design in New York, the Art Students League in New York, and the American Academy in Rome. He is an associate member of the National Academy of Design, New York, and a member of the following: National Society of Mural Painters, New York; Fine Arts Federation of New York; Municipal Arts Society; American Artists Professional League; Architectural League of New York. He has received the following awards: Prix de Rome, 1916; Medal, Los Angeles Museum, 1926; Medal, American Artists Professional League, 1945. (See Who's Who in American Art, 1947.)

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT N-1

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Interior Department Building
Washington D. C.

February 20, 1952

MEMORANDUM TO: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Lynn has received an inquiry from Senator Green with reference to completing the unfinished portion of the historical friese in the rotunda of the Capitol, as authorized by Public Law 703 of the 81st Congress.

Mr. John Walker, Chief Curator of the National Gallery, recommends that Mr. Allyn Cox, 135 E. 40th Street, New York, be considered for this work. Mr. Cox studied at the National Academy of Design in New York, the Art Students League in New York, and the American Academy in Rome. He is an associate member of the National Academy of Design, New York, and a member of the following: National Society of Mural Painters, New York; Fine Arts Federation of New York; Municipal Arts Society; American Artists Professional League; Architectural League of New York. He has received the following awards: Prix de Rome, 1916; Medal, Los Angeles Museum, 1926; Medal, American Artists Professional League, 1945. (See Who's Who in American Art, 1947.)

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

EXHIBIT M-1

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

March 4, 1952

Dear Mr. Anderson:

In accordance with your request, The Commission of Fine Arts was very glad to receive your assistant, Mr. William Fahey, at the meeting held on February 26, 1952, and to view the design which he submitted for a barracks building for five hundred airmen which it is proposed to erect on grounds west of the Washington National Airport.

The designs for the Washington National Airport received careful study by The Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission feels that the proposed building, even though it is to be used for barracks purposes, should be in keeping with the main airport building. The Commission, therefore, would have been glad to consider your plans at an earlier stage, rather than in the stage of working drawings, as submitted on February 25th. The members of the Commission were of the opinion that a more economical building and a more satisfactory result could have been achieved if plans for the building had been submitted to the Commission at an earlier date.

The Commission of Fine Arts understands that a restudy of the design has been recommended, and in this the Commission unanimously concurs. The members of the Commission feel that an improvement can be made in the grouping of the buildings, and also that a new site plan should be prepared. The Commission would also prefer a facade of concrete rather than one of cinder blocks and brick panels as proposed.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Arthur L. Anderson
Architect
1726 M Street, N. W.
Washington D. C.

cc to: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
The Commission of Fine Arts.

def/f

EXHIBIT O

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington D. C.

March 4, 1952

Dear Mr. Anderson:

In accordance with your request, The Commission of Fine Arts was very glad to receive your assistant, Mr. William Pahy, at the meeting held on February 26, 1952, and to view the design which be submitted for a barracks building for five hundred airmen which it is proposed to erect on grounds west of the Washington National Airport.

The designs for the Washington National Airport received careful study by The Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission feels that the proposed building, even though it is to be used for barracks purposes, should be in keeping with the main airport building. The Commission, therefore, would have been glad to consider your plans at an earlier stage, rather than in the stage of working drawings, as submitted on February 25th. The members of the Commission were of the opinion that a more economical building and a more satisfactory result could have been achieved if plans for the building had been submitted to the Commission at an earlier date.

The Commission of Fine Arts understands that a restudy of the design has been recommended, and in this the Commission unanimously concurs. The members of the Commission feel that an improvement can be made in the grouping of the buildings, and also that a new site plan should be prepared. The Commission would also prefer a facade of concrete rather than one of cinder blocks and brick panels as proposed.

For The Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Arthur L. Anderson
Architect
1726 M Street, N. W.
Washington D. C.

cc to: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
The Commission of Fine Arts.

def/t

EXHIBIT O